

1 I. NEEL CHATTERJEE (STATE BAR NO. 173985)  
2 nchatterjee@orrick.com  
3 MONTE M.F. COOPER (STATE BAR NO. 196746)  
4 mcooper@orrick.com  
5 THERESA A. SUTTON (STATE BAR NO. 211857)  
6 tsutton@orrick.com  
7 MORVARID METANAT (STATE BAR NO. 268228)  
8 mmetanat@orrick.com  
9 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
10 1000 Marsh Road  
11 Menlo Park, CA 94025  
12 Telephone: 650-614-7400  
13 Facsimile: 650-614-7401  
14 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
15 FACEBOOK, INC.  
16

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
19 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION  
20

21 FACEBOOK, INC.,  
22 Plaintiffs,  
23 v.  
24 POWER VENTURES, INC. a Cayman Island  
25 Corporation; STEVE VACHANI, an  
26 individual; DOE 1, d/b/a POWER.COM,  
27 DOES 2-25, inclusive,  
28 Defendants.  
29

Case No. 5:08-cv-05780 JW (JCS)

**FACEBOOK, INC.'S OBJECTIONS  
TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED BY  
DEFENDANTS IN SUPPORT OF  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Dept: Courtroom 9, 19th Floor  
Judge: Hon. Chief Judge James Ware

30 FILED UNDER SEAL  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
8010  
8011  
8012  
8013  
8014  
8015  
8016  
8017  
8018  
8019  
8020  
8021  
8022  
8023  
8024  
8025  
8026  
8027  
8028  
8029  
8030  
8031  
8032  
8033  
8034  
8035  
8036  
8037  
8038  
8039  
8040  
8041  
8042  
8043  
8044  
8045  
8046  
8047  
8048  
8049  
8050  
8051  
8052  
8053  
8054  
8055  
8056  
8057  
8058  
8059  
8060  
8061  
8062  
8063  
8064  
8065  
8066  
8067  
8068  
8069  
8070  
8071  
8072  
8073  
8074  
8075  
8076  
8077  
8078  
8079  
8080  
8081  
8082  
8083  
8084  
8085  
8086  
8087  
8088  
8089  
8090  
8091  
8092  
8093  
8094  
8095  
8096  
8097  
8098  
8099  
80100  
80101  
80102  
80103  
80104  
80105  
80106  
80107  
80108  
80109  
80110  
80111  
80112  
80113  
80114  
80115  
80116  
80117  
80118  
80119  
80120  
80121  
80122  
80123  
80124  
80125  
80126  
80127  
80128  
80129  
80130  
80131  
80132  
80133  
80134  
80135  
80136  
80137  
80138  
80139  
80140  
80141  
80142  
80143  
80144  
80145  
80146  
80147  
80148  
80149  
80150  
80151  
80152  
80153  
80154  
80155  
80156  
80157  
80158  
80159  
80160  
80161  
80162  
80163  
80164  
80165  
80166  
80167  
80168  
80169  
80170  
80171  
80172  
80173  
80174  
80175  
80176  
80177  
80178  
80179  
80180  
80181  
80182  
80183  
80184  
80185  
80186  
80187  
80188  
80189  
80190  
80191  
80192  
80193  
80194  
80195  
80196  
80197  
80198  
80199  
80200  
80201  
80202  
80203  
80204  
80205  
80206  
80207  
80208  
80209  
80210  
80211  
80212  
80213  
80214  
80215  
80216  
80217  
80218  
80219  
80220  
80221  
80222  
80223  
80224  
80225  
80226  
80227  
80228  
80229  
80230  
80231  
80232  
80233  
80234  
80235  
80236  
80237  
80238  
80239  
80240  
80241  
80242  
80243  
80244  
80245  
80246  
80247  
80248  
80249  
80250  
80251  
80252  
80253  
80254  
80255  
80256  
80257  
80258  
80259  
80260  
80261  
80262  
80263  
80264  
80265  
80266  
80267  
80268  
80269  
80270  
80271  
80272  
80273  
80274  
80275  
80276  
80277  
80278  
80279  
80280  
80281  
80282  
80283  
80284  
80285  
80286  
80287  
80288  
80289  
80290  
80291  
80292  
80293  
80294  
80295  
80296  
80297  
80298  
80299  
80300  
80301  
80302  
80303  
80304  
80305  
80306  
80307  
80308  
80309  
80310  
80311  
80312  
80313  
80314  
80315  
80316  
80317  
80318  
80319  
80320  
80321  
80322  
80323  
80324  
80325  
80326  
80327  
80328  
80329  
80330  
80331  
80332  
80333  
80334  
80335  
80336  
80337  
80338  
80339  
80340  
80341  
80342  
80343  
80344  
80345  
80346  
80347  
80348  
80349  
80350  
80351  
80352  
80353  
80354  
80355  
80356  
80357  
80358  
80359  
80360  
80361  
80362  
80363  
80364  
80365  
80366  
80367  
80368  
80369  
80370  
80371  
80372  
80373  
80374  
80375  
80376  
80377  
80378  
80379  
80380  
80381  
80382  
80383  
80384  
80385  
80386  
80387  
80388  
80389  
80390  
80391  
80392  
80393  
80394  
80395  
80396  
80397  
80398  
80399  
80400  
80401  
80402  
80403  
80404  
80405  
80406  
80407  
80408  
80409  
80410  
80411  
80412  
80413  
80414  
80415  
80416  
80417  
80418  
80419  
80420  
80421  
80422  
80423  
80424  
80425  
80426  
80427  
80428  
80429  
80430  
80431  
80432  
80433  
80434  
80435  
80436  
80437  
80438  
80439  
80440  
80441  
80442  
80443  
80444  
80445  
80446  
80447  
80448  
80449  
80450  
80451  
80452  
80453  
80454  
80455  
80456  
80457  
80458  
80459  
80460  
80461  
80462  
80463  
80464  
80465  
80466  
80467  
80468  
80469  
80470  
80471  
80472  
80473  
80474  
80475  
80476  
80477  
80478  
80479  
80480  
80481  
80482  
80483  
80484  
80485  
80486  
80487  
80488  
80489  
80490  
80491  
80492  
80493  
80494  
80495  
80496  
80497  
80498  
80499  
80500  
80501  
80502  
80503  
80504  
80505  
80506  
80507  
80508  
80509  
80510  
80511  
80512  
80513  
80514  
80515  
80516  
80517  
80518  
80519  
80520  
80521  
80522  
80523  
80524  
80525  
80526  
80527  
80528  
80529  
80530  
80531  
80532  
80533  
80534  
80535  
80536  
80537  
80538  
80539  
80540  
80541  
80542  
80543  
80544  
80545  
80546  
80547  
80548  
80549  
80550  
80551  
80552  
80553  
80554  
80555  
80556  
80557  
80558  
80559  
80560  
80561  
80562  
80563  
80564  
80565  
80566  
80567  
80568  
80569  
80570  
80571  
80572  
80573  
80574  
80575  
80576  
80577  
80578  
80579  
80580  
80581  
80582  
80583  
80584  
80585  
80586  
80587  
80588  
80589  
80590  
80591  
80592  
80593  
80594  
80595  
80596  
80597  
80598  
80599  
80600  
80601  
80602  
80603  
80604  
80605  
80606  
80607  
80608  
80609  
80610  
80611  
80612  
80613  
80614  
80615  
80616  
80617  
80618  
80619  
80620  
80621  
80622  
80623  
80624  
80625  
80626  
80627  
80628  
80629  
80630  
80631  
80632  
80633  
80634  
80635  
80636  
80637  
80638  
80639  
80640  
80641  
80642  
80643  
80644  
80645  
80646  
80647  
80648  
80649  
80650  
80651  
80652  
80653  
80654  
80655  
80656  
80657  
80658  
80659  
80660  
80661  
80662  
80663  
80664  
80665  
80666  
80667  
80668  
80669  
80670  
80671  
80672  
80673  
80674  
80675  
80676  
80677  
80678  
80679  
80680  
80681  
80682  
80683  
80684  
80685  
80686  
80687  
80688  
80689  
80690  
80691  
80692  
80693  
80694  
80695  
80696  
80697  
80698  
80699  
80700  
80701  
80702  
80703  
80704  
80705  
80706  
80707  
80708  
80709  
80710  
80711  
80712  
80713  
80714  
80715  
80716  
80717  
80718  
80719  
80720  
80721  
80722  
80723  
80724  
80725  
80726  
80727  
80728  
80729  
80730  
80731  
80732  
80733  
80734  
80735  
80736  
80737  
80738  
80739  
80740  
80741  
80742  
80743  
80744  
80745  
80746  
80747  
80748  
80749  
80750  
80751  
80752  
80753  
80754  
80755  
80756  
80757  
80758  
80759  
80760  
80761  
80762  
80763  
80764  
80765  
80766  
80767  
80768  
80769  
80770  
80771  
80772  
80773  
80774  
80775  
80776  
80777  
80778  
80779  
80780  
80781  
80782  
80783  
80784  
80785  
80786  
80787  
80788  
80789  
80790  
80791  
80792  
80793  
80794  
80795  
80796  
80797  
80798  
80799  
80800  
80801  
80802  
80803  
80804  
80805  
80806  
80807  
80808  
80809  
80810  
80811  
80812  
80813  
80814  
80815  
80816  
80817  
80818  
80819  
80820  
80821  
80822  
80823  
80824  
80825  
80826  
80827  
80828  
80829  
80830  
80831  
80832  
80833  
80834  
80835  
80836  
80837  
80838  
80839  
80840  
80841  
80842  
80843  
80844  
80845  
80846  
80847  
80848  
80849  
80850  
80851  
80852  
80853  
80854  
80855  
80856  
80857  
80858  
80859  
80860  
80861  
80862  
80863  
80864  
80865  
80866  
80867  
80868  
80869  
80870  
80871  
80872  
80873  
80874  
80875  
80876  
80877  
80878  
80879  
80880  
80881  
80882  
80883  
80884  
80885  
80886  
80887  
80888  
80889  
80890  
80891  
80892  
80893  
80894  
80895  
80896  
80897  
80898  
80899  
80900  
80901  
80902  
80903  
80904  
80905  
80906  
80907  
80908  
80909  
80910  
80911  
80912  
80913  
80914  
80915  
80916  
80917  
80918  
80919  
80920  
80921  
80922  
80923  
80924  
80925  
80926  
80927  
80928  
80929  
80930  
80931  
80932  
80933  
80934  
80935  
80936  
80937  
80938  
80939  
80940  
80941  
80942  
80943  
80944  
80945  
80946  
80947  
80948  
80949  
80950  
80951  
80952  
80953  
80954  
80955  
80956  
80957  
80958  
80959  
80960  
80961  
80962  
80963  
80964  
80965  
80966  
80967  
80968  
80969  
80970  
80971  
80972  
80973  
80974  
80975  
80976  
80977  
80978  
80979  
80980  
80981  
80982  
80983  
80984  
80985  
80986  
80987  
80988  
80989  
80990  
80991  
80992  
80993  
80994  
809

1 Plaintiff Facebook, Inc. hereby objects to the Declaration of Steve Vachani in Support of  
 2 Defendants Power Ventures, Inc. and Steve Vachani Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No.  
 3 98), and Defendants' reliance on the Deposition testimony of a Facebook employee, Craig Clark,  
 4 in Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment as follows:

5 1. Facebook objects under Federal Rules of Evidence 401, 402, 602 and 701 to  
 6 paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of the Vachani Declaration on the grounds that  
 7 the testimony lacks foundation and constitutes improper and irrelevant opinions, conclusions, and  
 8 speculation rather than factual averments.

9 2. Facebook objects under Federal Rules of Evidence 401, 402, and 602 to  
 10 Defendants' references to Craig Clark's deposition testimony in support of their Summary  
 11 Judgment Motion on the grounds that Mr. Clark has no personal knowledge of the underlying  
 12 facts of this litigation.

13 **I. APPLICABLE RULES OF EVIDENCE**

14 Federal Rule of Evidence 701 provides that “[i]f the witness is not testifying as an expert,  
 15 the witness' testimony in the form of opinions or inferences is limited to those opinions or  
 16 inferences which are (a) rationally based on the perception of the witness, (b) helpful to a clear  
 17 understanding of the witness' testimony or the determination of a fact in issue, and (c) not based  
 18 on a scientific, technical or other specialized knowledge within the scope of Rule 702.” Fed. R.  
 19 Evid. 701; *see also Christiansen v. Nat'l Savings and Trust Co.*, 683 F.2d 520, 529 (D.C. Cir.  
 20 1982) (inadmissibility of conclusion that defendants held a “fiduciary” relationship to plaintiffs).  
 21 Here, Defendants offer objectionable testimony in Vachani's Declaration.

22 “A witness may not testify to a matter unless evidence is introduced sufficient to support a  
 23 finding that the witness has personal knowledge of the matter. Fed. R. of Evid. 602. *See also*  
 24 *Nat'l Steel Corp. v. Golden Eagle Ins. Co.*, 121 F.3d 496, 502 (9th Cir. 1997) (affirming district  
 25 court's exclusion of evidence due to a lack of personal knowledge in a summary judgment  
 26 proceeding); *Bank Melli Iran v. Pahlavi*, 58 F.3d 1406, 1412 (9th Cir. 1995) (declarations by  
 27 counsel in a summary judgment proceeding were entitled to no weight where counsel lacked  
 28 personal knowledge). Here, Defendants cannot show that Mr. Clark has any personal knowledge

1 regarding the underlying facts of this litigation. Nor are they unable to show that Mr. Vachani  
 2 has personal knowledge regarding the functionality of Defendants' source code used to access the  
 3 Facebook website and services.

4 Federal Rule of Evidence 401 defines “[r]elevant evidence” as “evidence having any  
 5 tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the  
 6 action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.” Evidence which is  
 7 not relevant is not admissible. Fed. R. Evid. 402.

8 **II. OBJECTIONS TO THE VACHANI DECLARATION**

9 Facebook objects to paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of the Vachani  
 10 Declaration on the grounds that the testimony lacks foundation and constitutes improper opinions,  
 11 conclusions, and speculation rather than factual averments. Fed. R. Evid. 602 & 701; *see also*  
 12 *WNS Holdings, LLC v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*, No. 08-cv-275-bbc, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
 13 59829, \*11 (W.D. Wis. Jul. 14, 2009) (disregarding portions of lay witness's testimony where the  
 14 testimony required specialized knowledge and witness had not been disclosed as an expert  
 15 witness); *Nichols v. Johnson*, No. 00C7785, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7745, \*11 (N.D. Ill. April 30,  
 16 2002) (noting that Rule 701's requirement that lay opinion testimony not be “based on scientific,  
 17 technical or other specialized knowledge within the scope of Rule 702” is there to “insure[] that a  
 18 party will not evade the expert witness disclosure requirements . . . by simply calling an expert  
 19 witness in the guise of a lay person.”).<sup>1</sup>

20 **A. Vachani Is Not A Qualified Expert And Thus Cannot Offer Expert**  
 21 **Testimony.**

22 Steve Vachani is Power Ventures' CEO and has not been offered as an expert witness.  
 23 Yet, Vachani makes several averments requiring an expert's analysis of Defendants' source code  
 24 and the manner in which it interacted with the Facebook website. For example, in paragraph 3 of  
 25 his declaration, Vachani asserts that Facebook “initiated” the transmission of “email invitations  
 26 . . . through the event creation process.” *See* Appendix A at 1. In paragraph 4, Vachani states

27 <sup>1</sup> For brevity, Facebook offers examples of the objectionable testimony in Vachani's Declaration.  
 28 Attached hereto as Appendix A is a chart listing Facebook's specific objections to Vachani's  
 Declaration.

1 that “Power did not send the email messages referenced in the complaint.” *See id.* at 2.  
 2 Vachani’s testimony in paragraphs 11 and 12 fare little better. *See id.* at 7. These paragraphs  
 3 largely comprise Vachani’s opinions regarding Power’s connection to the Facebook website after  
 4 Facebook had implemented its blocks connected to the Facebook website. Vachani lacks the  
 5 required technical expertise to make such assertions. Indeed, Mr. Vachani admitted that he is  
 6 “not a skilled [computer] programmer by profession” and that he has no personal knowledge  
 7 about how PowerScript software Defendants used to connect to the Facebook website even  
 8 functioned. *See* the Declaration of Theresa A. Sutton in Support of Facebook’s Opposition to  
 9 Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, Ex. 1 at 12:24-13:15; 14:1-5; 182:16-186:6; 189:10-  
 10 191:8; 195:23-197:13; 203:19-206:22; 209:11-15; 212:19-213:4; 254:2-15; 256:8-257:10;  
 11 257:22-267:22; 273:6-274:10.

12 **B. Vachani Is Not An Attorney And Is Not Qualified To Render Legal Opinions.**

13 Vachani’s declaration also includes impermissible legal conclusions, which must be  
 14 disregarded. Vachani is not a licensed attorney and is not qualified to render the conclusions he  
 15 does. For example, his statements regarding who “initiated” or “sent” the messages at issue  
 16 constitute legal conclusions and are, thus, impermissible lay opinion testimony. *See* 15 U.S.C.  
 17 § 7704(a)(1).

18 **C. Vachani’s Testimony Is Not Helpful To A Clear Understanding Of Testimony  
Or Determinant Of Fact In Issue And Is Thereby Irrelevant.**

19 The vast majority of Vachani’s declaration is not helpful to a clear understanding of any  
 20 testimony or determination of any facts in issue. For example, in paragraph 5, Vachani states that  
 21 “All of the content in these email messages that Facebook alleges to be misleading and false was  
 22 written and appended to the message by Facebook itself.” *See* Appendix A at No. 4. Not only is  
 23 Vachani unqualified to make such statements, Vachani’s testimony is misleading. Misleading,  
 24 conclusory allegations with no factual support are improper and should not be considered by the  
 25 Court. *Whitlock v. Pepsi Americas*, 681 F. Supp. 2d 1123, 1125 (N.D. Cal. 2010). Facebook  
 26 does not contend that the misleading portions of Defendants’ Launch Promotion messages are  
 27 limited to just the “From:” field and closing signature, but rather, that the messages in their  
 28

1 entirety are misleading. The messages appear to be generated by Facebook users when, in reality,  
 2 Power induces its users to send messages to Facebook users by offering them monetary incentives  
 3 and then uses its automated software to generate and transmit these messages through the  
 4 Facebook system and servers. *See* 11/14/11 Mot. for Partial Summ. J on Count 1 at 13:27-14:8.  
 5 Therefore, the fact that the “from” field and signature were automatically appended to the  
 6 messages by Facebook’s systems after Power had initiated the transmission of these messages is  
 7 irrelevant and unhelpful.

8 In paragraph 8, Vachani declares that no one has “complained to Power about any of  
 9 [their] activities related to Facebook. Nor has anyone claimed to have been misled by anything  
 10 [Defendants] did.” *See id.* at 5. Whether anyone complained to Power or claims to have been  
 11 misled are irrelevant to Facebook’s claims against Power. Indeed, the issue is whether the  
 12 commercial messages are misleading. Thus, Vachani’s testimony on this subject has no bearing  
 13 on the case and will not assist in the determination of any issues in this matter.

14 Vachani’s opinions constitute impermissible lay opinion testimony. His declaration is rife  
 15 with inaccuracies, legal conclusions, and self-serving, unsupported and irrelevant averments.  
 16 Vachani’s testimony should not be considered.

17 **III. OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANTS’ RELIANCE ON THE DEPOSITION**  
**TESTIMONY OF CRAIG CLARK.<sup>2</sup>**

18 Defendants’ reliance on the deposition testimony of Craig Clark, a Facebook employee,  
 19 also is improper. As an initial matter, Mr. Clark was not deposed as Facebook’s 30(b)(6) witness,  
 20 but rather, in his individual capacity. Sutton Decl., Ex. 3 at 7:5-6; 81:8-18; 85:22-86:1; 107:11-  
 21 12. Of particular significance is the fact that Mr. Clark was not even a Facebook employee  
 22 during the time the underlying events of this litigation occurred. *Id.* at 7:5-6. For example, Mr.  
 23 Clark does not have personal knowledge of the process by which Power generated and  
 24 transmitted its Launch Promotion Invitation messages to Facebook users. *Id.* at 68:10-69:25;

25  
 26 <sup>2</sup> For brevity, Facebook offers examples of the Defendants’ objections to Defendants’ references  
 27 to Craig Clark’s deposition testimony. A complete list of Facebook’s objections to Mr. Clark’s  
 28 testimony is included in Appendix A, attached hereto. In addition, the relevant portions of Mr.  
 Clark’s deposition testimony are attached as Ex. 3 to the Declaration of Theresa A. Sutton in  
 Support of Facebook’s Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (“Sutton  
 Decl.”).

1 cited in Def. MSJ. Nor does Mr. Clark have any personal knowledge of the particular injuries  
2 and losses suffered by Facebook as a result of Defendants' conduct. *Id.* at 116:14-18. Mr.  
3 Clark's personal knowledge regarding Defendants' actions, and the subsequent actions taken by  
4 Facebook as a result of such actions, is understandably limited and not relevant to Facebook's  
5 claims against Defendants.

6 **IV. CONCLUSION**

7 For the foregoing reasons, Facebook objects to paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,  
8 and 13 of Vachani's Declaration and to Defendants' reliance on the deposition testimony of Craig  
9 Clark in Support of their Motion for Summary Judgment, as referenced in Appendix A, and  
10 respectfully requests that the Court disregard them.

11 Dated: December 2, 2011

12 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

13 

---

14 /s/*Morvarid Metanat* /s/

15 **Morvarid Metanat**  
16 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
17 FACEBOOK, INC.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**APPENDIX A**  
**Facebook, Inc.'s Evidentiary Objections to Defendants' Evidence in Support of**  
**Defendants' Motion of Summary Judgment**

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
1.	<p><b>Paragraph 2 of the Vachani Declaration</b>            "Power did not send the email messages referenced in the compliant. Facebook sent those messages."</p>	<p><b>Improper Expert Testimony/Lacks Foundation/Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation/Relevance.</b>            The process by which the relevant messages were transmitted to Facebook users is contained in Defendants' and Facebook's source code and requires expert analysis. Vachani does not have the required technical background to make such assertions. Therefore, his testimony regarding this matter is irrelevant.</p> <p><b>Legal Conclusion.</b>            Whether Facebook or Defendants sent the message at issue is a legal conclusion to be determined by the Court. <i>Evangelista v. Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific</i>, 777 F.2d 1390, 1398 n.3 (9th Cir. 1985) (lay witness may not testify as to a legal conclusion).</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
2.	<p><b>Paragraph 3 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>Statements regarding who initiated the transmission of the unsolicited commercial messages to Facebook users.</p>	<p><b>Improper Expert Testimony/Lacks Foundation/Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>The process by which the relevant messages were transmitted to Facebook users is contained in Defendants' and Facebook's source code and requires expert analysis. Vachani does not have the required technical background to make such assertions. Therefore, his testimony regarding this matter is irrelevant.</p> <p><b>Legal Conclusion.</b></p> <p>Whether Facebook or Defendants sent the message at issue is a legal conclusion to be determined by the Court. <i>Evangelista v. Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific</i>, 777 F.2d 1390, 1398 n.3 (9th Cir. 1985) (lay witness may not testify as to a legal conclusion).</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>
3.	<p><b>Paragraph 4 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>“Power did not send the email messages referenced in the complaint. Facebook did. Facebook solely determined the content of the ‘From:’ field, and it supplied the closing signature from ‘The Facebook Team.’ Neither the user nor Power has any control over these elements of the email message”</p>	<p><b>Improper Expert Testimony/Lacks Foundation/Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>The process by which the relevant messages were generated and transmitted to Facebook users is contained in Defendants' and Facebook's source code and requires expert analysis. Vachani does not have the required technical background to make such assertions. Therefore, his testimony regarding this matter is irrelevant.</p> <p><b>Legal Conclusion.</b></p> <p>Whether Facebook or Defendants sent the message at issue is a legal conclusion to be determined by the Court. <i>Evangelista v. Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific</i>, 777 F.2d 1390, 1398 n.3 (9th Cir. 1985) (lay witness may not testify as to a legal conclusion).</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
4.	<p><b>Paragraph 5 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>“All of the content in these email messages that Facebook alleges to be misleading and false was written and appended to the message by Facebook itself. In fact, Facebook appends that very same text to every email communication it sends after an event is created. Even if the ‘From:’ field and closing signature were misleading in any way, Power had no control over them.”</p>	<p><b>Improper Expert Testimony/Lacks Foundation/Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>The process by which the relevant messages were generated and transmitted to Facebook users is contained in Defendants’ and Facebook’s source code and requires expert analysis. Vachani does not have the required technical background to make such assertions.</p> <p>Moreover, this testimony is misleading. First, it is not Facebook’s contention that the misleading portions of Defendants’ Launch Promotion messages are limited to just the “From:” field and closing signature, but rather, that the messages in their entirety are misleading because the messages appear to be generated by Facebook users when, in reality, Power induces its users, and uses its automated software to, generate and transmit these messages through the Facebook system and servers. Therefore, the fact that the “from” field and signature were automatically appended to the messages by Facebook’s systems <i>after</i> Power had initiated the transmission of these messages is irrelevant.</p> <p>In addition, the actual content of the Event Invitation (which Defendants admit to drafting), identifies Power as a “host” of a reunion event” and provides a time frame for the Event. Dkt. Nos. 9 at ¶ 70, 54 at ¶ 70; Declaration of Theresa A. Sutton in Support of Facebook’s Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (“Sutton Decl.”), Ex. 2, 209:5-7; 213:5-10. Power was “hosting” nothing and the time frame identified for the Event was meaningless. Therefore, the actual content of the message itself is also misleading.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
5.	<p><b>Paragraph 6 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>“The specific email referenced in the complaint was generated by Facebook as a result of a Facebook user named ‘Nik’ creating an event and selecting the friends to invite. It was Nik not Power, that logged on to Facebook and created the event. It was Nik, not Power, that chose the friends he wished to invite. Nik could only send the invitation to other Facebook members who had agreed to ‘friend’ Nik, and thus had expressly agreed to receive communications from Nik. Facebook then sent an email to those friends on Nik’s behalf. Power did not initiate this message. Power did not select the recipients to whom it was sent. And Power had no control over the content of the message and the header information.”</p>	<p><b>Improper Expert Testimony/Lacks Foundation/Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>The process by which the relevant messages were generated and transmitted to Facebook users is contained in Defendants’ and Facebook’s source code and requires expert analysis. Vachani does not have the required technical background to make such assertions. Therefore, his testimony regarding this matter is irrelevant.</p> <p>This testimony is also misleading. Conveniently left out of Vachani’s testimony is the fact that Defendants offered Power users monetary incentives to initiate the transmission of the referenced emails to Facebook, conduct that is in violation of the CAN-SPAM Act. 11/14/11 Mot. Partial Summ. J. on Count 1 13:1814:8.</p> <p><b>Legal Conclusion.</b></p> <p>Whether Facebook or Defendants transmitted the referenced emails is a legal conclusion to be determined by the Court. <i>Evangelista v. Inlandboatmen’s Union of the Pacific</i>, 777 F.2d 1390, 1398 n.3 (9th Cir. 1985) (lay witness may not testify as to a legal conclusion).</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
6.	<p><b>Paragraph 7 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>“Power had no control over the return electronic mail address. Only Facebook did. And Power had no ability to include any opt-out mechanism in the message. It was Facebook, and Facebook alone, that determined whether to include an opt-out mechanism in the message.”</p>	<p><b>Improper Expert Testimony/Lacks Foundation/Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>The process by which the relevant messages were generated and transmitted to Facebook users is contained in Defendants’ and Facebook’s source code and requires expert analysis. Vachani does not have the required technical background to make such assertions. Therefore, his testimony regarding this matter is irrelevant.</p> <p><b>Mischaracterization of Facts:</b></p> <p>As admitted by Defendants, Power is responsible for drafting this content and had complete control over what was included in the message, including information sufficient to provide the recipient with a method to opt out of receiving any further messages initiated by Power. Sutton Decl., Ex. 2, 209:5-10; 213:5-9.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>
7.	<p><b>Paragraph 8 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>“Like Facebook, Power also has not received a single complaint from a Facebook user about any of the events in Facebook’s complaint. No one complained to Power about the emails referenced in ¶ 92 of Facebook’s complaint. Nor has anyone complained to Power about any of our activities related to Facebook. Nor has anyone claimed to have been misled by anything we did.”</p>	<p><b>Relevance.</b></p> <p>Whether Power received any complaints from Facebook users regarding any of the events in Facebook’s complaint is irrelevant to Facebook’s claims against Power. Similarly, whether anyone complained to Power about any of Defendants’ activities related to Facebook has no bearing on Facebook’s claims against Defendants. Finally, whether any individuals were actually misled by Defendants’ conduct is also irrelevant to Facebook’s claims against Defendants.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402</b></p>

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
8.	<p><b>Paragraph 9 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>“Power did not transmit any email message to any Facebook account. Nor did Power make available any utility that would enable a user to transmit such messages.”</p>	<p><b>Improper Expert Testimony/Lacks Foundation/Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>The process by which the relevant messages were transmitted to Facebook users is contained in Defendants’ and Facebook’s source code and requires expert analysis. Vachani does not have the required technical background to make such assertions. Therefore, his testimony regarding this matter is irrelevant.</p> <p>Moreover, this testimony is misleading. Facebook claims that Power “initiated” and “procured” the transmission of these email messages to Facebook users—not merely that Power “transmitted” them. 11/14/11 Mot. Partial Summ. J. on Count 1, 12:8:8.</p> <p><b>Legal Conclusion.</b></p> <p>Whether Facebook or Defendants transmitted the messages at issue is a legal conclusion to be determined by the Court. <i>Evangelista v. Inlandboatmen’s Union of the Pacific</i>, 777 F.2d 1390, 1398 n.3 (9th Cir. 1985) (lay witness may not testify as to a legal conclusion).</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
9.	<p><b>Paragraph 10 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>“Power did not access any nonpublic portion of Facebook’s website. Power merely offered users a different and potentially superior browser through which they could access their Facebook accounts to copy, update, and/or port their own ‘User Content.’ And users did so by entering their own valid usernames and passwords, which Power never copied or stored for any purpose. Furthermore, Power did not obtain any software, data, or other content of value from Facebook. The only data accessed through Power’s utilities were user’s own ‘User Content,’ over which Facebook has disclaimed any ownership.”</p>	<p><b>Improper Expert Testimony/Lacks Foundation/Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>The process by which Power connected to the Facebook website is contained in Defendants’ source code and requires expert analysis. Vachani does not have the required technical background to make such assertions. Therefore, his testimony regarding this matter is irrelevant.</p> <p>Facebook also objects to the statement “And users did so by entering their own valid usernames and passwords, which Power never copied or stored for any purpose,” in that it is contradicted by Power’s Responses to Facebook’s First Set of Requests for Admission on Power (certified by Steve Vachani himself), where Power admits to storing “Facebook user login information, including, but not limited to, user login names, email addresses or passwords.” <i>See</i> Sutton Decl., Ex. 4 at Request No. 15; <i>see also id.</i> at Request No. 51 (Power admits that between January 1, 2008 and present date, they “stored, saved, or otherwise retained Facebook user log-in information, such as user names and/or passwords.”).</p> <p><b>Legal Conclusion.</b></p> <p>Whether Defendants obtained anything from value from the Facebook website is a legal conclusion to be determined by the Court. <i>Evangelista v. Inlandboatmen’s Union of the Pacific</i>, 777 F.2d 1390, 1398 n.3 (9th Cir. 1985) (lay witness may not testify as to a legal conclusion).</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
10.	<p><b>Paragraph 11 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>“At some time during December 2008, Facebook began blocking one of the IP addresses Power had used. Power did not undertake any effort to circumvent that block, and did not provide users with any tools designed to circumvent it. Nevertheless, Facebook’s IP block was ineffective because it blocked only one outdated IP address Power had used, and did not block other IPs that Power was using in the normal course of business. After the blocking, Power undertook efforts to implement Facebook Connect as Facebook had requested.”</p>	<p><b>Improper Expert Testimony/Lacks Foundation/Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation.</b></p> <p>The process by which Power connected to the Facebook website after Facebook implemented technical blocks is contained in Defendants’ source code and requires expert analysis. Vachani does not have the required technical background to make assertions regarding Power’s ability to connect to the Facebook website after Facebook implemented its blocks against Power. Therefore, his testimony regarding this matter is irrelevant.</p> <p>Moreover, Vachani’s testimony is misleading. Vachani’s Declaration is carefully worded in an attempt to get around the Court’s previous finding that circumvention of Facebook’s technical blocking measures could result in Defendants’ liability. Specifically, Vachani asserts that “At some time during December 2008, Facebook began blocking one of the IP addresses Power had used. Power did not undertake any effort to circumvent that block, and did not provide users with any tools designed to circumvent it.” Vachani Decl., at ¶ 11. Defendants did not make any effort to circumvent Facebook’s blocks at that time, however, only because their circumvention measures had already been written into the PowerScript and no further efforts were required for them to continue to access the Facebook website. <i>See Declaration of Lawrence Melling in Support of Facebook’s Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment ¶¶ 34-42.</i></p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
11.	<p><b>Paragraph 12 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>“We did not circumvent any technical barriers. And we voluntarily turned off the integration even though Facebook’s IP blocking attack was partial, incomplete, and ineffective.”</p>	<p><b>Improper Expert Testimony/Lacks Foundation/Lacks Personal Knowledge/Speculation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>The process by which Power connected to the Facebook website after Facebook implemented technical blocks is contained in Defendants’ source code and requires expert analysis. Vachani does not have the required technical background to make assertions regarding Power’s ability to connect to the Facebook website after Facebook implemented its blocks against Power.</p> <p>Moreover, Vachani’s testimony is erroneous and misleading. Defendants turned off the “integration” with Facebook only after circumventing Facebook’s blocks numerous times. <i>See</i> Melling Decl., ¶¶ 34-42; Declaration of Joseph Cutler in Support of Facebook’s Mot. for Partial Summ. J. on Count 1 (“Cutler Decl.”), Ex. C at 3.</p> <p><b>Legal Conclusion.</b></p> <p>Whether Defendants circumvented Facebook’s technical blocks is a legal conclusion to be determined by the Court. <i>Evangelista v. Inlandboatmen’s Union of the Pacific</i>, 777 F.2d 1390, 1398 n.3 (9th Cir. 1985) (lay witness may not testify as to a legal conclusion).</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
12.	<p><b>Paragraph 13 of the Vachani Declaration</b></p> <p>“The only intended use and the only actual use of the Power browser was to display the user’s own Facebook account and to enable the user to copy and/or update the user’s own “User Content.” We had no scheme to defraud, deceive or extort anyone. Nor could the Power browser be used for such a scheme. Nor, to my knowledge, was the Power browser used for such a scheme.”</p>	<p><b>Speculation/Lacks Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Vachani’s testimony that the Power browser could not be used in a “scheme to defraud, deceive or extort anyone” is mere speculation.</p> <p>Moreover, whether Defendants had a “scheme to defraud, deceive or extort anyone,” is not the relevant inquiry. Rather, Section 1030(a)(4) of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act requires that a Defendant to knowingly and with an “intent to defraud” access a Plaintiff’s computers without, or in excess of, authorization. Courts have held that for the purposes of the CFAA, fraud “simply means wrongdoing.” <i>Multiven, Inc. v. Cisco Systems, Inc.</i>, 725 F. Supp. 2d 877, 892 (N.D. Cal. 2010);</p> <p><b>Legal Conclusion.</b></p> <p>Whether Defendants had an intent to defraud (under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act) is a legal conclusion to be determined by the Court. <i>Evangelista v. Inlandboatmen’s Union of the Pacific</i>, 777 F.2d 1390, 1398 n.3 (9th Cir. 1985) (lay witness may not testify as to a legal conclusion).</p> <p>Vachani reaches improper legal conclusion by assuming the meaning of “without authorization” and incorrectly identifies whose “authorization” is needed.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602 &amp; 701.</b></p>

No.	Evidence Objected To	Objections
13.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Page 118, lines 20-23</b></p> <p>Q. So you're not aware of any documents that are responsive to any of these three categories?</p> <p>A. As I sit here today, I'm not aware of any specific documents.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. He has no personal knowledge of the expenditures made by Facebook as a result of the events described in Facebook's First Amended Complaint, and therefore cannot assert any factual evidence related to such. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>
14.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Page 58, lines 5-7</b></p> <p>Q. Can you tell me the name of anyone that was misled by this message?</p> <p>A. I can't.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. He has no personal knowledge regarding who was misled by Defendants' Launch Promotion messages, and therefore cannot assert any factual evidence related to such. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>

No.	EVIDENCE OBJECTED TO	OBJECTIONS
15.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Pages 68-69, lines 10-25, respectively</b></p> <p>Q. All right. So let me focus in on just the "from" line. Okay? The one-and-only party that has any control over the content of that line is Facebook itself; isn't that true?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Speculation.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: As I said, I'm not sure. I believe so, but I'm not sure.</p> <p>MR. BURSOR: Q. If Power wanted to change that line just to say "From: Power," they have no ability to do that; isn't that true?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Speculation.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: I don't believe they would.</p> <p>MR. BURSOR: Q. There's no one at Power that wrote "From: Facebook &lt;eventmaster . . ." and the rest of that line; right? That drafting did not come from anyone at Power?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Speculation.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: I don't believe anybody would draft this. This would be an automated part of the e-mail creation that would occur when somebody initiated the transmission of a message. Right. So, I mean, there's nobody sitting there typing the "from" line.</p> <p>MR. BURSOR: Q. Right.</p> <p>A. That would be part of how e-mail works.</p> <p>Q. That "from" line was automatically generated by Facebook's computers; right?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Speculation.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: That's pretty -- excuse me.</p> <p>That's pretty -- I'm sorry.</p> <p>Can you repeat the -- can you read back the question?</p> <p>(Record read as follows:</p> <p>"QUESTION: That 'from' line was automatically generated by Facebook's computers; right?"</p> <p>THE WITNESS: Automatically generated by Facebook's computers or their systems, based on a prompt from somebody outside. Right? Could be a user. Could be whoever -- whoever's creating the event.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. He has no personal knowledge regarding the specific process by which Defendants' Launch Promotion Invitations were generated and transmitted to Facebook users and therefore cannot assert any factual evidence related to such. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>

No.	Evidence Objected To	Objections
16	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Pages 74-75, lines 16-6, respectively</b></p> <p>Q. And then do you see in the body of the message it says "Nik invited you"?</p> <p>A. Mm-hmm, yes.</p> <p>Q. Who's Nik?</p> <p>A. I don't know who Nik is.</p> <p>Q. Did Nik initiate this message?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Speculation.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: I don't know who Nik is, so</p> <p>I don't know if Nik initiated this message. But my understanding is this was initiated on behalf of a user named Nik through Power.</p> <p>MR. BURSOR: Q. What's the basis for that understanding?</p> <p>A. The --</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Attorney-client privilege. Instruction not to answer.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. He has no personal knowledge regarding the message referenced by Defendants' nor the specific process by which Defendants' Launch Promotion Invitations were generated and transmitted to Facebook users and therefore cannot assert any factual evidence related to such. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>
17.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Pages 87-88, lines 12-4, respectively</b></p> <p>Q. You see at the bottom of the page where it says "Thanks, The Facebook Team"?</p> <p>A. Mm-hmm.</p> <p>Q. Yes?</p> <p>A. Yes.</p> <p>Q. Who wrote that?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Speculation.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>MR. BURSOR: Q. Didn't Facebook itself write that?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Same objections.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>MR. BURSOR: Q. Isn't it true that Facebook appends that very same text to every e-mail communication it sends after an event is created?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Same objection. Speculation.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. He has no personal knowledge regarding the message referenced by Defendants' nor the specific process by which Defendants' Launch Promotion Invitations were generated and transmitted to Facebook users and therefore cannot assert any factual evidence related to such. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>

No.	Evidence Objected To	Objections
18.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Pages 98-99, lines 18-25, respectively</b></p> <p>Q. So you see where it says "Nik invited you to the event"? See that?</p> <p>A. I see where it says: "Nik [Redacted] invited you to the event" --</p> <p>Q. Okay.</p> <p>A. -- "Bring --</p> <p>Q. No. I'm only asking --</p> <p>A. "100 friends" --</p> <p>Q. -- you about that part. "Nik . . . invited you to the event" -- "Nik [Redacted] invited you to the event . . ." Can you focus in on that?</p> <p>A. I can focus in on that, yes.</p> <p>Q. Who wrote that?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Speculation.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: I don't recall -- or I don't know.</p> <p>MR. BURSOR: Q. Who would know the answer to that?</p> <p>A. Again, I believe the header information, as with other elements of this message, would have been auto-generated. So as far as "write this," I don't know who would write this.</p> <p>Q. It would have been auto-generated by whom?</p> <p>A. By the --</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Vague.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: By the system that was called to send out the invitation.</p> <p>MR. BURSOR: Q. What system is that?</p> <p>A. That would probably be Facebook's system.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. He has no personal knowledge regarding the message referenced by Defendants' nor the specific process by which Defendants' Launch Promotion Invitations were generated and transmitted to Facebook users and therefore cannot assert any factual evidence related to such. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>

No.	Evidence Objected To	Objections
19.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Page 51, lines 18-21</b></p> <p>Q. Have you ever seen a document concerning a Facebook user complaining about something that Power did on Facebook?</p> <p>A. I don't believe so.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. He has no personal knowledge of complaints received by Facebook from its users regarding Defendants' conduct, and therefore cannot assert any factual evidence related to such. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>
20.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Page 121, lines 6-25</b></p> <p>Q. You see 3 asks for any complaints Facebook users made as a result of the events described in Facebook's First Amended Complaint? You see that?</p> <p>A. I see that.</p> <p>Q. But you've never seen any documents like that; right?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Overly broad, vague.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: Again, there are documents I've seen that may be responsive to this category. If you're asking if I've seen any specific complaints about Power.com, I have not.</p> <p>MR. BURSOR: Q. Have you seen general complaints about Power.com?</p> <p>A. No.</p> <p>Q. All right. So you haven't seen any specific complaints and you haven't seen any general complaints. What kind of complaints have you seen?</p> <p>A. I've not seen any complaints regarding Power.com based on my preparation for this deposition or otherwise.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. He has no personal knowledge of complaints received by Facebook from its users regarding Defendants' conduct, and therefore cannot assert any factual evidence related to such. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>

No.	Evidence Objected To	Objections
21.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Page 116, lines 14-18</b></p> <p>Q. Can you identify anything that Power did that caused Facebook to lose money?</p> <p>A. Same answer.</p> <p>Q. You can't answer?</p> <p>A. I can't answer that.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. He has no personal knowledge of the losses incurred by Facebook as a result of Power's conduct, and therefore cannot assert any factual evidence related to such. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>
22.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Page 117, lines 18-25</b></p> <p>Q. Are you aware of any document concerning any injury that Facebook suffered as a result of the events described in the First Amended Complaint? Just the existence of a document.</p> <p>A. I don't know.</p> <p>Q. As you sit here today, you couldn't identify any document that would relate to that?</p> <p>A. No, I don't believe I can.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. He has no personal knowledge of the injuries suffered by Facebook as a result of the events described in Facebook's First Amended Complaint, and therefore cannot assert any factual evidence related to such. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>

No.	Evidence Objected To	Objections
23.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Page 23, lines 11-17</b></p> <p>Q. All right. Sitting here today, is it true that Facebook users may be contacted only by Facebook or other registered Facebook users?</p> <p>A. I think that you need to read this paragraph in the context with the other paragraphs. But if you're talking about users of the site being contacted through the site, then yes.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. Defendants have not provided a foundation for Mr. Clark's knowledge regarding the methods by which Facebook users may be contacted. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>
24.	<p><b>Clark Deposition, Page 26, lines 2-12</b></p> <p>[ ]So far as you're aware, there have been no instances where an e-mail from an outside source was transmitted to a user's Facebook account?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Lacks foundation, calls for speculation.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>MR. BURSOR: Q. Okay. Sitting here today, can you identify any instance when that has happened?</p> <p>MR. CHATTERJEE: Same objections.</p> <p>THE WITNESS: I cannot.</p>	<p><b>Lack of Personal Knowledge/Lack of Foundation/Relevance.</b></p> <p>Facebook objects to Defendants' reliance on this portion of Mr. Clark's deposition testimony. Mr. Clark was deposed in his individual capacity, not as Facebook's 30(b)(6) designee and he was not employed at Facebook when the operative events in this action occurred. Defendants have not provided a foundation for Mr. Clark's knowledge regarding the transmission of messages to Facebook users' accounts. Mr. Clark's testimony on this issue is without proper foundation and should be disregarded as irrelevant.</p> <p><b>F.R.E. §§ 401-402, 602.</b></p>

1 I. NEEL CHATTERJEE (STATE BAR NO. 173985)  
nchatterjee@orrick.com  
2 MONTE M.F. COOPER (STATE BAR NO. 196746)  
mcooper@orrick.com  
3 THERESA A. SUTTON (STATE BAR NO. 211857)  
tsutton@orrick.com  
4 MORVARID METANAT (STATE BAR NO. 268228)  
mmetanat@orrick.com  
5 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
1000 Marsh Road  
6 Menlo Park, CA 94025  
Telephone: 650-614-7400  
7 Facsimile: 650-614-7401  
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
FACEBOOK, INC.  
9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13  
14 FACEBOOK, INC.,

Case No. 5:08-cv-05780 JW

15 Plaintiffs,

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
FACEBOOK, INC.'S OBJECTIONS  
TO EVIDENCE SUBMITTED BY  
DEFENDANTS IN SUPPORT OF  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

16 v.

17 POWER VENTURES, INC. a Cayman Island  
18 Corporation; STEVE VACHANI, an  
individual; DOE 1, d/b/a POWER.COM,  
19 DOES 2-25, inclusive,

Dept: Courtroom 9, 19th Floor  
Judge: Hon. Chief Judge James Ware

20 Defendants.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1       The Court, having considered Facebook, Inc.'s Evidentiary Objections to Evidence  
2 Submitted by Defendants in Support of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, and the  
3 records and papers on file in this action, hereby orders as follows:

4       Paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of the Declaration of Steve Vachani in  
5 Support of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, and references to the testimony of  
6 Craig Clark, shall be excluded for purposes of summary judgment. Citations and references  
7 thereto in Defendants' summary judgment briefing are stricken from the record, and the  
8 assertions they allegedly support shall be disregarded.

9  
10      **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11  
12      Dated:

---

13  
14  
15      Honorable James Ware  
16           Chief Judge  
17           Northern District of California

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28